

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

VOL. 4.--NO. 28.

SALEM, OHIO, FRIDAY, MARCH 2, 1849.

WHOLE NO. 184.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE

Is published every Friday, at Salem, Columbia Co., Ohio, by the Executive Committee of the Western Anti-Slavery Society; and is the only paper in the Great West which advocates secession from pro-slavery governments and pro-slavery church organizations. It is Edited by BENJAMIN S. and J. ELIZABETH JONES; and while urging upon the people the duty of holding "No union with Slaveholders," either in Church or State, as the only consistent position an Abolitionist can occupy, and as the best means for the destruction of slavery; it will, so far as its limits permit, give a history of the daily progress of the anti-slavery cause—exhibit the policy and practice of slaveholders, and by facts and arguments endeavor to increase the zeal and activity of every true lover of Freedom. In addition to its anti-slavery matter, it will contain general news, choice extracts, moral tales, &c. It is to be hoped that all the friends of the Western Anti-Slavery Society—all the advocates of the Disunion movement, will do what they can to aid in the support of the paper, by extending its circulation. You who live in the West should sustain the paper that is published in your midst. The Bugle is printed on an imperial sheet, and subscribers may take their choice of the following

TERMS.

\$1.50 per annum, if paid within the first 6 months of the subscriber's year.
If paid before three months of the year has expired, a deduction of 25 cents will be made, reducing the price to \$1.25.
If payment be made in advance, or on the receipt of the first number, 50 cents will be deducted, making the subscription but \$1.
To any person wishing to examine the character of the paper, it will be furnished 6 months, for 50 cents in advance to all others 75 cents will be charged.
No deviation from these terms.
We occasionally send numbers to those who are not subscribers, but who are believed to be interested in the dissemination of anti-slavery truth, with the hope that they will either subscribe themselves, or use their influence to extend its circulation among their friends.
Communications intended for insertion to be addressed to the Editors. All others to the Publishing Agent, JAMES BARNARD.

South Carolina Resolutions.

SENATE CHAMBER, Washington, Feb. 6th.
Mr. BUTLER presented resolutions passed by the Legislature of South Carolina, declaring the readiness of that State to cooperate with her sister States in resisting the application of the principles of the Wilmot proviso to the territory recently acquired by the United States, which he desired to have read; and the resolutions were accordingly read, as follows:

"The Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives upon Federal Relations, to which were referred so much of the Governor's message as relates to the agitation of slavery, and sundry resolutions upon the same subject, beg leave to report the following resolution, as expressing the undivided opinion of this Legislature upon the Wilmot proviso, and all similar violations of the great principle of equality which South Carolina has so long and so ardently maintained should govern the action of the States and the laws of Congress upon all matters affecting the rights and interests of any member of this Union:

Resolved, unanimously. That the time for discussion by the slaveholding States as to their exclusion from the territory recently acquired from Mexico has passed, and that this General Assembly, representing the feelings of the State of South Carolina, is prepared to cooperate with her sister States in resisting the application of the principles of the Wilmot proviso to such territory, at any and every hazard.

Resolved, unanimously. That the Governor be requested to transmit a copy of this report to the Governors of each of the States of this Union, and to our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. B. said: Mr. President, when a sovereign State presents such a resolution as the one read from your table, it is a significant omen of the times. Its very brevity is a commentary upon its import and intent. It purports to have been passed by both branches of the Legislature, and in the name of the people of South Carolina, and comes here under the seal of the State. It is my duty to say that it is not the expression of transient popular excitement, but it evinces the deep conviction of a people who think that their rights are dangerously threatened, and will be put in peril by the action of Congress, which is the common agent, and should be the common guardian of all the parties to the Federal compact.

South Carolina will not seek or desire an occasion for the application of her resolution. She will do no offensive act to bring about such a painful emergency. But should she be forced to meet the threatened issue, and required to take an attitude of resistance to the unjust and aggressive policy of a blind and self-sustaining majority, it would be treason in me as her representative to suppose that she would not make her words good, or subject herself to all the hazards of a trial. And in this she will not be alone. Virginia has already spoken a language too solemn and deliberate to be mistaken, and which was made the more impressive by the language of my friend who sits near me, [Mr. Hunter.] When States make such pledges, their representatives, they impose upon themselves an obligation to maintain them. The people of South Carolina entertain a profound respect for Virginia, and many of her people cherish hereditary attachment to her soil, history, and institutions. South Carolina will stand by her to the last, and sustain her in whatever position she may think proper to

assume; and will do so in the motto of my own State, which language cannot be more appropriately used than on this occasion—"Animus epibique semper parati." Well has it become that illustrious Commonwealth to be the first in proclaiming her own and the rights of her southern confederates. Well has she been called a mother of States.—Look at those that have sprung from her bounty. With the uncalculating generosity of a parent, she submitted to conditions, as to some of these territories ceded by her, peculiarly favorable at that time to her non-slaveholding brethren. Can it be that, like a cockatrice, any portion of these States, or the people of these States, would avail themselves of these conditions, and the power acquired under them, to sting the bosom that gave them life? Virginia may have to submit to ingratitude, and may not be able to avoid wanton insult, but she cannot submit to deliberate wrong and wilful aggression.—Her history would relate and her resolutions would reproach her. No, sir, that illustrious Commonwealth has been, like Judah, the lion's whelp in this Confederacy; and she cannot crouch, like Issachar, and become the ass between burdens.

Mr. President, Virginia and South Carolina are not the only States that will speak on this momentous subject. All the southern States similarly situated will use language of the same deliberate import; and if, in the face of such warning, our northern brethren—for I will call them so—shall turn a deaf ear to it, and shall go on to consummate their acts of injustice and disfranchisement by edicts and discriminating legislation, assailing the equality of the States, and violating sacred contracts, the blame will be on their heads. Such an act will evince a criminal temerity hardly to find a parallel in the history of any people. They may assume to be the work of wise, practical, and patriotic statesmen, and the guarantee they relied upon for its maintenance and perpetuity was the good faith in which it originated. Those from the non-slaveholding States were then the guardians of southern rights and the respecters of southern feelings. They were such men as Hancock, Adams, Roger Sherman, and Dr. Franklin. Little could they have thought that a people who have become strong and powerful under the operation of the Federal compact would ever use it as an engine of oppression. But, sir, I fear that their generous calculations are destined to be disappointed. And, sir, I will now draw a contrast between themselves and those who are now, under the name of free soil and deceitful philanthropy, conducting the dangerous agitation upon the slave question. I will not draw the parallel. The contrast between the two will be obvious to all, and it is not necessary to write their names on the picture. All the fears of disunion may be banished, and harmony restored by the North consulting and acting upon the great maxims of moderation and justice. Let them stay the hand of aggressive violence; let them stay the spirit of injustice; let them no longer encourage the wild fanaticism of an irresponsible multitude. The South will act in defensive cooperation, but will not intentionally agitate, for the purposes of faction and discord, with a view to profit by them. The northern people say that slavery cannot go into California and New Mexico, unless the laws left in force by Mexico shall be repealed; and yet they insist upon superadding to any act that may be brought forward for the government of those Territories, a provision for the exclusion of slavery; not, as they say, that it is necessary, but because they wish now to establish the doctrine to exclude southern slaveholders from an equal participation in the fruits of future conquest. This doctrine, Mr. President, addresses itself to, and is revolting to, natural sensibility, and in violation of the compact and compromises of the Constitution. It is nothing more nor less than saying that the South may be compelled, under its obligations to the Federal compact, to make its contributions of men and money to carry on the war, but shall be denied the rights of equals in the enjoyment of the conquest.

It is not a restriction, sir, as some have said, and as some of our Georgia friends have said, sir; but it is a prescriptive policy, to prevent which the South should be prepared at this time to make every sacrifice. If we submit to it now, it is a submission which will reduce us from a position of equality to what we believe will be one of degradation. I have made no threat—I shall make no threat. I have no such disposition; but if South Carolina shall be placed in such a situation, there can be no doubt but that she will enforce that resolution. I am bound to say, sir, that if this position be forced upon her, she will stand by Virginia; she will stand by herself, sir. This may be avoided; and God grant, Mr. President, that all concerned patriots may be raised up from the non-slaveholding States who may have courage to do justice, and who will consult the dictates of wisdom and prudence.

An Exchange says:—"The United States have, by the war with Mexico, won the respect and admiration of all civilized nations." O, what a WHAPEE!

House of Representatives.

FRIDAY, Dec. 16th 1849.

A petition was presented by Mr. Townsend, from 40 individuals of Portage and Stark counties, in favor of a dissolution of the Federal Union.

Mr. Armstrong moved that the petition be laid upon the table, and the petitioners have leave to withdraw the same. Mr. Townsend wished it received and referred to a select committee.—There were reasons, which might be shown, why the petition could not, and ought not, to be granted. The better way to dispose of it was to state those reasons.

Mr. Leiter was opposed to the reference. He favored the utmost reasonable limits of the right of petition; but this was of a character which ought not to be tolerated.

Mr. Holcomb moved to reject the petition. He did not deny the right of petition—the paper has been read, and we know its contents—and nothing further was due from us.

Mr. McClure hoped the petition would be referred to the gentleman who presented it, and that a report would be made on the subject. He condemned the prayer of the petitioners declared it to be one which could not be granted; and wished to have the reasons shown why it could not be granted.

Mr. Smith, of Madison, opposed the rejection of the petition. It would be an infringement of the right of petition, and he could not vote for it. The paper was an improper one; but let us refer it to a committee.

Mr. Roeder declared the paper to be a reasonable one; and would treat it with silent contempt. Mr. Men thought no course of treatment toward such a petition could be called ungenerous. It ought not to be entertained; and the fact that it contained the signature of a minister of the gospel furnished no reason why it should not be rejected.

Mr. Norris advocated its reference.—The right is guaranteed to the citizens of this country to change their form of government when they see proper; and the fact that a minority petition for this change furnished no argument to his mind for its rejection. He hoped it would be referred.

Mr. Vorhes thought it was due to the character of the State that the paper should not be reported upon.

Mr. Whitely and Mr. Smith, of Brown, spoke briefly on the subject. Mr. Marsh defended the utmost bounds of the right of petition, let the subject be as objectionable as it might. He favored the reference of the petition.

The debate was continued by Messrs. Leiter and Roeder; when the House refused to reject—yeas 16, nays 49.

Mr. Roeder moved the petitioners have leave to withdraw their petition—lost, yeas 21, nays 42.

The question being upon laying the petition on the table, it was lost, yeas 30, nays 34.

Several motions for reference to select and standing committees were voted down.

Mr. Whitely moved to refer it to a committee of the whole House—lost, yeas 4, nays 54.

The House then took a recess. 3 o'clock, P. M.

The petition for a dissolution of the Union was finally, after further debate by Messrs. Leiter and Riddle, referred to Mr. Townsend, by a vote of yeas 34, nays 20.

ABROAD AND AT HOME.—The Rev. Dr. Durbin, in his account of his tour in the East, describes a visit to the slave market of Alexandria, where beautiful girls were exposed for examination and sale like cattle. He concludes the narrative with the remark: "I turned with horror at the scene before me, where virtue had not even the privilege of contest nor the apology for temptation."

Are such scenes any less horrible in the United States than in Egypt? or did the Nubian girls in the Alexandrian markets, that he has no word of rebuke for the similar exposure of American females in the flesh markets of Washington and Baltimore and New Orleans?—Or do the fogs of our atmosphere hide these enormities from his vision? or is it that he stood in Egypt as a man, within the reach of human sympathies, and on his return he has again risen into the cold eminence of his doctorate, away from the sound and sight of human woe?

Dr. Durbin cannot be ignorant of the fact that the slave market in the national capital, which daily exhibits scenes no less shocking to feeling hearts than the one he describes, exists by the toleration and support of Congress and the people of the North.

Yet he professes to "preach the gospel" to this people, to be a minister of

Him who came "to proclaim deliverance to the captive," and what word of rebuke does he ever speak against the abominations of American slavery and the slave-trade? What earnest appeals does he ever make to the men and women of his own church to unite their efforts to put away the sin and shame from our country, and especially from the capital of the nation? We understand that the Pacha of Egypt has prohibited the slave markets within his borders, but they remain in Washington and the American Alexandria. Again we ask, why do we hear no cry of horror, no word of rebuke, from this great Methodist divine, at these inhumanities in our midst and under our sanction? Are shame which Mohammedanism cannot endure, to be cherished by Christians? Shall cruelties too monstrous for a despotism, find shelter in a republic, and "Christian ministers" cry "all's well," while the stench of those pollutions fills the land? Alas for our religion which delivers heresy over to eternal damnation, which imprisons poor news boys for selling papers on Sunday, and sheds tears of sympathy over hounded and slaves in other lands, but tolerates or licenses the traffic in human beings at home.—Pa. Freeman.

IMPORTANT FROM MEXICO.—By the arrival at New Orleans, on the 1st inst. of the U. S. schooner Arispe, dates from Tampico to the 23d ult. have been received.

A serious difficulty had occurred between General Guerrero, the commandant of the port of Tampico, and Captain Carr, acting U. S. Quartermaster at that place. The commandant had ordered Captain Carr to quit the city within a specified time, saying that the time allowed in the treaty of peace for the removal of the United States property had expired. This order Captain Carr refused to obey, saying he was acting under the orders of his government, and would not leave unless expelled by force; whereupon the commandant ordered out all the troops in the city, to the number of 400, but at this juncture the U. S. sloop of war Saratoga entered the harbor, when the troops retired into their quarters. Capt. Carr and Mr. Chase, the American consul, went on board the Saratoga, which set sail for Vera Cruz, the rendezvous of the gulf squadron, which it was supposed would proceed to Tampico, in order to settle the difficulty.

Divine Authority. One of the premonitory symptoms that announce the approaching death of an institution is seen in the extravagant claims set up in its favor. On the eve of a revolution or reformation, the defenders of that which is to be changed assume the most testing attitudes. The members of a decaying noble family are usually more haughty than those who live in prosperity. The fashionable lady whose charms have begun to fade, decks herself more gaudily than ever. When the advocates of a human institution begin to claim divine authority in its favor, it may be taken for granted that they are hard pressed. When they can find no warrant on earth, they try to get one in heaven.

We were reminded of the positions of some of the defenders of slavery by reading Mayday's account of the doctrines of that great stickler for the divine right of kings, James the First. A great change was taking place in the minds of the people, who were beginning to free themselves from the shackles of the dark ages. But James claimed more than had been claimed by those of his predecessors, who had the firmest hold of power. "It was gravely maintained that the Supreme Being regarded hereditary monarchy as opposed to other forms of government, with peculiar favor; that the rule of succession in the order of primogeniture was a divine institution, anterior to the Christian, and even to the Mosiac dispensation; that no human power, not even that of the whole Legislature—no length of adverse possession, though it extended to ten centuries, could deprive the legitimate prince of his rights; that his authority was necessarily always despotic; that the laws by which, in England and in other countries, the prerogative was limited, were to be regarded merely as concessions which the sovereign had freely made and might at his pleasure resume; and, that any treaty into which a king might enter with his people was merely a declaration of his present intentions, and not a contract of which the performance could be demanded."

These doctrines were advanced just before the people betook a king for undertaking to carry them out.—Lou. Examiner.

From the Christian Citizen. What are Life's Duties?

Cast your eyes abroad over the world and behold them for yourselves. See how its loveliness and beauty have been marred by the work of man's unholiness. Behold the sorrow and the sufferings of the millions of human beings who are debared the privilege of drawing the needful sustenance for their bodies from the bosom of our good mother earth, though God has endowed it with a capacity so wonderfully adapted to the wants, the comforts, the convenience and the happiness of man. Open your ears and hear the universal sorrow-tone that arises from among the habitations of the

children of men. Listen to the voice which speaks from every abode of poverty, from the crushed and bleeding hearts of earth's lowly ones, and from the hard stern natures of the wicked and the vile.

Hear what life's duties are in the sighing breezes from the South that bear upon their wings the mournful clanking of the poor bond man's chains. Hear what life's duties are as they are repeated by the echoing rafters of the garrets of the very poor, and by the desponding hearts and unfed sides of thousands upon thousands who are doomed to lives of the severest though unrequited toil. Let the boisterous but hollow laugh of the courtisan who has been driven perhaps from the path of duty and virtue by the power of that fiend, which the proverb tells us will "eat through stone walls" speak to our convictions in regard to the duties of life. Let the glow of the red flames of destruction and moral death; of the distillery lighted with the lurid fires of hell as it gleams out upon the midnight darkness and poisons the very atmosphere with its accursed taint of sin and shame shadow them. Let all these cunningly contrived pitfalls of intemperance and licentiousness, where drunkenness and debauchery allure the unsuspecting to their downfall remind us of them. Let the tramping of the war horse, the glittering of sabres, the braying of trumpets, the clashing of bayonets, and the roar of cannon, while they proclaim that man is still engaged in the foul, unnatural work of butchering his brothers, remind us of higher and nobler deeds that it is ours to perform "in the world's broad field of battle, in the bivouac of life." T. D.

From the [Philadelphia] U. States Gazette.

Mr. Calhoun's Address.

"Oh wad some power the gillie gie us, To see ourselves as others see us, It wad frae many a blunder free us, An' foolish notion."

Mr. Calhoun wants from the North the "pound of flesh," because "the law gives it." His grand complaint is, that the freemen of the North feel and develop an extreme reluctance to aid the South in catching poor slaves who have essayed an escape from bondage. He would have us crush every sentiment of sympathy, out of reverence for the Constitution! Suppose we turn the tables. Does not the same Constitution guarantee the right of freedom of speech and of the press? Has the South, while it asks aid for slavecatchers at the North, allowed freemen of the North their constitutional liberty of speech at the South? Who scourged Amos Dresser in the public square of Nashville, for circulating books friendly to Liberty? Who broke the press and attempted the life of Cassius M. Clay at Lexington? Who led on the mob to assail Dr. Bailey at Washington? Who broke open and scattered the United States mail at Charleston? Who expelled Samuel Hoar from South Carolina, because his errand, though strictly legal, dispensed the civility of the South?

Who a few years since sent circulars to all the Northern Legislatures to procure the passage of laws to prevent freemen of the North from discussing slavery? Who, on the floor of Congress, decried, session after session, the right of Northern freemen even to petition Congress for the better government and regulation of the District of Columbia, as to human liberty? Who threatened on the floor of Congress to lynch John Quincy Adams, if he should ever be caught in South Carolina? What State drags from his vessel the honest colored cook of Boston, and immures him in a dungeon, lest the example of his liberty should render unduly the human chains of Charleston and New Orleans?—Where did Lynch law originate in this land? Where is its dreadful code mercilessly applied to stifle the discussion of human rights?

"Softly, my master!" Those who read us lectures on reverence for the Constitution, should see to it that their own hands are pure. Mr. Calhoun annexed Texas avowedly to conserve slavery.—Let us now see to it that the annexation of New Mexico and California shall not limit "the area of freedom." The tears of the great patriot of the 19th century, (because he is not allowed to shackle a free Empire with human bondage,) are very touching. We hope he will be able to bear his sorrow with fortitude, for "He that hath but tears to give, Must weep those tears alone!"

LATER FROM CALIFORNIA.

Washington, Feb. 13, 1849.

The Washington Union of this morning, contains later intelligence from California. The news is of a corresponding character to what has been previously received, and fully confirms all other official accounts. The news also furnishes the public with murders of a revolting nature, which are occurring almost daily.

The Charleston Mercury of the 11th Jan., notices the sale of a lot of "prime

negro women" at an advanced price, and says, "this is a substantial evidence that the demand is good for this species of property." If the negroes of Africa should kidnap some of our American women, and sell them as a "prime article," what would we say?—And yet what make the mighty difference?—Chicago Tribune.

MORE MODESTY.—A gathering of slaveholders and nullifiers was recently held at Houston Texas, where, in addition to resolutions denouncing the Wilmot Proviso and the Oregon bill, the following in relation to the disputed boundary question, was passed:

Resolved. That the State of Texas claims to herself the right to settle and determine for herself her own boundaries, and that she will, when necessary, exercise that right at all hazards and against all parties. That her title to that portion of what was formerly the Department of New Mexico, lying this side of the Rio Grande, she carved out with the sword and with the sword she will maintain it, should the necessity be forced upon her.

The Rochester Democrat says that when Texas was a suppliant for admission into the Union, she readily consented to an express stipulation that "all questions of boundary should be subject to adjustment by the United States Government." But now she is firmly seated, after having cost the nation \$100,000,000, she defies all constituted authority and proposes to give law to the very power that raised her from her state of helplessness and degradation. Her claim, preposterous as it is, covering a large portion of the territory acquired by war, is favored by certain classes in Congress. Her insolence therefore is not to be wondered at.—Buffalo Express.

ANOTHER GOOD MOVE BY CONGRESS.—The House of Congress, having abolished flogging in the Navy, have followed up the good movement by abolishing the grog ration, which is two gills a day. In place of this the sailor is to receive four cents. If the Senate confirm these proceedings, we shall soon see a desirable improvement in the character of the Navy.

THE RICE CULTURE ABATED AS A NUISANCE.—Believing that the rice fields, in the vicinity of Savannah, were detrimental to the health of the city, the Mayor and Aldermen passed ordinances prohibiting the culture of rice within certain limits. From the decree in the court below, sustaining the ordinances, an appeal was taken by Thomas Green, the owner of a rice plantation, but the Supreme court affirmed the original decision.

Slavery in the District.—The Baltimore Clipper says:—"Although we deny the right of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia without the consent of the people and compensating owners, yet we have no objection to having the slave-trade abolished there by Congress or the local authorities. We do not think the District should be made a slave market—and hence we approve the effort which is now being made to arrest the traffic at the seat of government."

SOUTHERN SENTIMENT.—A friend has furnished us with the following extract from the letter of a gentleman residing in North Alabama. It expresses forcibly and well, a sentiment prevailing to a great extent, in the slave States, everywhere increasing. The writer is not a Northern man transplanted to the South, but a Southern man by birth, education, feeling and interest.—[Lou. Ex.

"We are very grateful for the newspapers you send us. I was particularly interested in the 'Examiner,' as it expresses my views fully, on the Slavery and Emancipation subject. Kentucky must certainly adopt some prospective emancipation laws, when the Convention meets, and Missouri will follow before long. The folly of the leading men in the South, who resist the restrictions of the Wilmot Proviso, &c., is very apparent to me, for anything that would cause a separation of the North from the South would, I believe, destroy the prosperity of the latter forever. I am determined that my family shall not participate in the ruin."

Address to the People of Hayti.

A committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, in an address to Haytiens, say:

"It will be satisfactory for you to know, that, during the last four years, the anti-slavery cause, though it has encountered much opposition, has, nevertheless, made rapid and gratifying progress in various parts of the world. Sweden, France, & Denmark, have each abolished slavery in their several colonies in the West Indies and South America, so that now, with the exception of the small islands possessed by Holland, and the colonies belonging to Spain in the Gulf of Mexico, the whole of the West India Islands are free from the degradation and oppressions of slavery. In addition, therefore, to the free people of your own Republic, more than a million of Africans and their descendants are rejoicing in the blessings of freedom. Nor is this all—the spirit of liberty is extending its triumphs in various directions. In addition to French Guiana and Cayenne, which are now free, it is satisfactory to know